REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2008 (Office Action). This response is filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, no fees are believed to be due. The Examiner is expressly authorized, however, to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claims Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-12 and 22-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0042083 to Saito, *et al.* (hereinafter Saito), in view of U.S. Patent 6,073,148 to Rowe (hereinafter Rowe), and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,776 to Guck (hereinafter Guck). Claims 13-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Guck.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the claim rejections, Applicants have amended the claims so as to expedite prosecution of the present application. It is expressly noted, however, that the amendments should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 14, and 22 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments. Claims 13 and 33 have been cancelled.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method for extracting data from a document formatted using a first

markup language and presenting the extracted data using a second, different markup language.

The method can include providing a content converter system operating as an interface between a client and a server. The content converter system can include one or more templates for extracting data from documents, a template table associating each template with a network location identifier of a particular document and a particular target markup language, and a markup language application for reformatting the extracted data using a different markup language. See, e.g., Specification, page 15, line 16 to page 19, line 9; see also Figs. 1 and 2.

The method also can include receiving a content request from the client by the content converter system and, responsive to the content request, identifying a template which corresponds to the specified document and the target markup language using the template table. The content request can specify a network location from which a specified document including formatted content in the first markup language can be retrieved and further indicates the second target markup language. The template can provide at least one content marker, which indicates a data offset for identifying within the specified document one or more data fields containing information corresponding to at least one of a type of data and a particular action. The template can further specify at least one of markup language tags, code, and additional text to associate with the information contained in a particular data field when presented in the target markup language. The template can be customized by a user to extract in one or more different combinations from the specified document information based upon the at least one content marker. See, e.g., Specification, page 20, line 11 to page 21, line 6; page 21, line 19 to page 22, line 2; page 16, line 19 to page 18, line 17; see also Fig. 3.

The method further can include retrieving the specified document from the specified network location, applying the template to the specified document and extracting data from the formatted content based upon the template, and formatting the information by the markup language application of the content converter system for presentation in a

11

presentation order based upon the associated markup language tags, code, and additional text specified in the template, thus producing a second document formatted for presentation according to the second target markup language. The step of applying the template, moreover, can include identifying a presentation order of the at least one content marker in the template and extracting the information in the data fields from said specified document in accordance with the presentation order. See, e.g., Specification, page 22, line 16 to page 25; see also Fig. 3.

The Claims Define Over the Cited References

The present invention concerns a method and system for extracting data from a document formatted using a first markup language and presenting the extracted data using a second, different markup language. More specifically, the present invention involves selecting a template from a list of templates in a template table based on the received document and the target markup language, applying the template to the received document to extract data from the received document, and reformatting the extracted data into a document using the second target markup language, which is different from the first markup language, for presenting the document to the client using a user interface corresponding to the second target markup language.

The present invention overcomes the disadvantages of the prior art "transcoding" method in which tags of the first markup language are substituted with corresponding tags of the second markup language. The mere substitution of tags in the prior art "transcoding" method does not account for differing user interfaces and can result, for example, in nonsensical sounding speech produced by a speech interface. See, e.g., Specification, page 4, line 4 to page 5, line 20. Although the present invention is particularly advantageous when the two different markup languages involved are of different modalities (text, speech, etc.), the method of the present invention is not limited to the situation where two different modalities are involved.

Saito discloses a user-defined search template for extracting information from documents. Saito is fundamentally different from the present invention, however, because

Saito does not teach or suggest reformatting the received document formatted using a first markup language into a second document using a second markup language. In the present invention, the received document is reformatted and presented using a different markup language or in a different user interface, but the content of the document does not change. In contrast, in Saito, the search result and the original document to be searched do not have the same content. The documents in Saito are two totally different documents, not the same document merely presented in different markup language formats as in the present invention. Clearly, Saito does not involve two different types of markup languages, especially not two different modalities, for presenting the same document.

Also, it is noted that the template used in Saito is for the purpose of searching, not for the purpose of extracting data from a document in order to reformat the extracted data using a different markup language and thus presenting the same document using the different markup language. Further, it is noted that in Saito the search template contains information for extracting user-defined information from a document (paragraph [0043]). In other words, the search templates extract different information from the same document. The search template is selected according to what information is desired to be extracted from the document. In contrast, in the present invention, all of the data will be extracted from the document in order to reformat the extracted data using a different markup language. In the present invention, the template is selected based on the type of document received and the type of the target markup language, not based on what information a user wants to find from the document.

The other cited references do not make up for the deficiencies of Saito. Rowe was cited as disclosing a marker that identifies an offset to be used to obtain the necessary content from a document. However, Rowe also does not disclose reformatting a document using an appropriate template and presenting the document using a different markup language.

Guck discloses that an original source document can be converted to a shadow file in a different format. However, Guck does not specify how the conversion is performed.

13

Guck merely describes that the converter will take the content of the source file and convert it into the desired format (col. 4, lines 53-54). Therefore, Guck also does not disclose extracting data from a document formatted in one markup language using an appropriate template, reformatting the extracted data, and presenting the document using a different markup language.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1, 14, and 22, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 14, and 22 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, 14, or 22 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claims rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **March 25, 2008**

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

14